THE ADMINISTRATIVE JUNGLE

by

A. D. Gorwala

Institute of Public Administration
Patna University
1957

PRICE 87 N. P.

Printed at Patna University Press, Patna

PREFACE

The "Administrative Jungle" consists of two stimulating lectures delivered by Sri A. D. Gorwala at the Institute of Public Administration, Patna University, on the 28th and 29th January, 1957. The author is an eminent authority in the field of Public administration and needs no introduction.

The lectures are based on a vast fund of administrative knowledge, and, I trust, would prove useful to students of Public Administration and the general public.

(P. S. Muhar)
M.A., Ph.D. (Harvard),
Director.

PATNA
August 2, 1957

Contents:

	Page
Preface	
Lecture I: Impenetrable Lairs and Fierce Animals	1
Lecture II: The Happy Warrior and The Safe Path	32

LECTURE I

Impenetrable Lairs and Fierce Animals

Sometime towards the end of 1953, the Prime Minister, who had then been in control of the Government of India for over six years, made one of those speeches in which his inmost feelings are revealed. He lamented the state of the administration; the Government of India was, he felt, an administrative jungle. His complaint about it fell into two parts. He was dissatisfied both with methods and with men. It seemed to him that the machinery of Government was out of gear and that the ideas of many of those who were working that machinery were wrong, especially their ideas about themselves.

The Government of India, he felt, was so big that work could scarcely be done efficiently. Yet it kept on growing at such a pace that it was difficult to keep track of all the developments and of the new departments and the new sub-departments that kept on appearing. Bodies were set up at various levels to effect co-ordination and then co-ordinating bodies had to be appointed to co-ordinate the co-ordinators. Even when an urgent job had to be done, years passed in creating appointments and in getting them filled. There were chaprasis everywhere, 19,000 of them as against 3,200 before the War. They carried files to and fro and delay had become the rule. Officers wrote long notes instead of talking to one another on the telephone or instead of dropping in on the man next door and saying what they

The thought-ways of these officials, specially in Delhi, also seemed to him wrong and harmful. They attached undue importance to status and emoluments. Men were respected because their salaries were counted by the thousand and they held high office. Others who did equally good or perhaps even better work were looked down upon because their salaries were lower and because the posts they held were not regarded as equally high by Government. It was the work done that should count and not the salary or the post. People should be content with doing their work well, and not concentrate most of the time on getting larger salaries and better status. As things were, he saw the whole governmental scene as the Administrative Jungle, through which it was extremely difficult to make one's way.

More than three years have passed since 1953 but so far as the Prime Minister is concerned, this woeful description still seems true. He is deeply dissatisfied even to-day. An aggrieved apprehension is apparent in almost all his public utterances about officials and administration. A kind of helpless agony appears to trouble him greatly. Almost he seems to despair, to feel pathetically "What can be done? These things must go on. There seems no way out." For him, the Administrative jungle remains and flourishes.

The use of the word jungle in this connection is extremely significant. The Prime Minister does not call the administration a grove, he does not call it a wood, he does not call it an unploughed field. He thinks of it as a Jungle. You could lose your way in a grove or a wood, find it hard going in an unploughed field, but it would not be too difficult

to find your way out of them. But a Jungle! That conveys the sense of mysterious tracks, hidden from the eye, of wild and unfamiliar beasts springing up suddenly. From these implications, I take the title of this first lecture which I call "Impenetrable Lairs and Fierce Animals". At one time I thought I would make it Wild Beasts, but many of the animals referred to are undoubtedly estimable and the term Beast carries, as you know, sometimes a certain undesirble connotation.

By the side of the Prime Minister's view of the Government of India administration as a Jungle, let us put another description I heard, in which too the animal-motif appears. Once upon a time, during the later years of the War, a senior and I were visiting Delhi. My companion was the Adviser in charge of Food in Bombay, where I was Supply Commissioner under him, and we had come to Delhi for discussions with the Food Department and various other officials. We had been going from one meeting to another, rushing along Secretariat corridors. You know how stereotyped and at the same time how confusing the Delhi buildings can be. Further, one may regard them, bewildering in their ramified uniformity, as replicas of official modes of thinking and processes. Something like this must have been passing through the Adviser's mind. As I was leading the way, he turned to me and said "This is quite a Rabbit Warren! How do you know your way about?" I answered "I served here for some years, Sir." He was not familiar with Delhi; all his service had been in a province. The important thing, however, was the way he thought about the Government of India. To him it was not a Jungle but a mere Rabbit Warren. He saw no dangerous wild

beasts in it, but domesticated animals, timid in movement, of a dull sameness of habit. He had no doubt that they would not be particularly difficult to handle and that prompt results could be obtained from them. The internal communication system seemed undoubtedly complicated, but to him there appeared nothing particularly mysterious about it.

Now why is there this difference? Why does the Prime Minister think of the people who work under him as strange animals, and of the whole organisation as a Jungle, and why did this official of many years' standing, consider the same people or their predecessors as simply rabbits and their place of work as just a warren? The real distinction it seems to me is that while the Adviser knew precisely what he wanted and knew how to get it, the Prime Minister in administrative matters often knows only very vaguely what he wants, and even when this vagueness has been reduced to precision, does not know how to set about getting what he wants. Any man who, like the Adviser, had served in high positions in a province all his life, generally felt that he had been in touch with real things so long, had faced so many situations, and dealt with so many crises that nothing very much could daunt him. His view of the Government of India was always slightly tinged with this feeling. To him, here were a set of people who dealt generally with papers. True, in a previous incarnation, many of them might have dealt with men and things, but up here, they were mostly clerks. His opinion of them was thus oriented. He knew that he could put his case properly. He knew their language and how to deal with them. The Prime Minister, on the other hand, has been dealing all his life with large crowds and with the ramifications of politics

and the behaviour of politicians. He had not acquired that practical ability necessary for dealing with officials, from whom one can get both extremely worth while and utterly worthless results.

Further, it has to be remembered when considering the lack of knowledge about what is wanted that "there are two ways in which a civil service can be reduced to impotence and inefficiency. One way is to have no policy and to give it no instructions. The other is to have more than one policy and to give it conflicting instructions." Since 1947, and even since 1953, both of these circumstances have prevailed. In many matters it would seem to any disinterested observer that the Government of India has not a policy. In many matters, it would seem that it has several policies, all being sought to be applied at the same time. Let us take the example of Goa. What is the Government of India's policy about Goa? It would perhaps be more correct to ask, What is the Government of India's aspiration about Goa? For what the Government of India has is an aspiration and not a policy, a policy being the method of raising an aspiration to achievement. What then is the aspiration with regard to Goa? The Government of India desires it to be a part of India. At the same time, it does not desire to take it over by force. Simultaneously, the Government of India has imposed a blockade which renders life extremely difficult for the local Goans. It prevents any money or supplies going to them. It is thus attempting to bring pressure on the local people, while keeping on telling them that it is their friend. The result of all this, the conclusion reached, amounts to not having any policy at all. The people, who would wish to be friends with the Government

of India, are because of the hardships caused to them by the Government of India's measures converted into, if not its opponents, at least non-sympathisers with it, and their rulers who are there, the Portuguese, are not hurt by any of these measurers. So that is one instance.

Take the Government's Price Policy. In this country, at the present moment, what is the Price Policy? Again, there is an aspiration. The aspiration is that prices must not rise; they must remain at a reasonable level. But all action taken tends towards raising prices. For instance, during the last year, which was not a good year agriculturally, but in which some produce were still available for buying, Government made very few purchases. It allowed stocks to run down. It even exported some grain and later, relied once again upon large imports. Some of the imports came in and some did not. Here conflicting policies would seem to have been in operation. At one time it is said no imports, but having put an import ban on, no proper measures are taken to see that the prices do not rise. Leave that to the market but at the same time prices must remain stable. Control there must not be because controls are bad, or the Government feels itself incapable of administering them. So, not enough supplies, no controls, but stable prices! The public servant in such circumstances finds it difficult to know where he stands.

Take another instance, Savings. You have been told again and again that the whole success of the Plan rests upon your individual efforts. The latest Congess Resolution stresses austerity, the cutting down of all consumption except only what is essential, saving, and lending to Government. These have

been proclaimed the keys to the solution of our difficult problem.

Now consider the amount of money that must have been spent on illuminations throughout the country on Republic Day. In Bombay alone, I believe it is estimated to have been over 10 lacs of rupees, and it must have been quite a good deal in Delhi and elsewhere. Consider also the other festivities and the cost that must have been incurred on them. All this was no doubt very entertaining and pleasure-giving to those who saw and enjoyed it, and very esteem-satisfying to those who organised it. Yet it does not make much sense if you are to save and I am to save and we are to cut out spending but Government itself is to encourage and incur lavish expenditure on ostentatious display and conspicuous consumption. I need not stress the point. Just think of the cost of the UNESCO Conference, several crores, I believe, including the building specially constructed for it, to say nothing of the Ashoka Hotel.

In these cases there does seem to be rather a conflict of policies. And when this kind of conflict occurs, the public servant is naturally somewhat disturbed. To the orderly progress of his mind towards operation arise obstacles. The word of command is not clearly expressed and sounds ambiguous with the result perhaps that some people march one way and some the other. The natural consequence is confusion, the confusion which the Prime Minister regards as characteristic of the jungle.

Leaving aside the absence or conflict of policy, are the problems which the Prime Minister mentions as constituting the Jungle such as bigness of Government, co-ordination, chaprasis, promptness in appoint-

ment and decision, are these such as to be effectively those impenetrable lairs because of which it becomes difficult to find one's way within and out of this Jungle? I do not think so. They seem, on the whole, to be comparatively simple. How big the Government of a country should be cannot be decided in a vacuum. Size can only be related to function. The government of so large a country, specially a government engaged on many new tasks not regarded as part of Government's duty in the *laissèz faire* atmosphere of the past, is bound to be big. The real question is not whether the Government is big, but whether, having regard to the work entrusted to it, it is bigger than it should be. From which follows, as a corollary, the further question, is it sufficiently streamlined, is it so fashioned that it can handle its proper work in the quickest and smoothest manner? Both from what the Prime Minister has said and from the many complaints current, the answer to the second question is "No, it is not so streamlined". Whether however it is bigger than it should be, we cannot tell because none of us is in a position to examine it thoroughly and properly. I believe at one time the Government of India did consider having a proper examination made by some one experienced and competent. It later seems to have felt that there was not much point in that because in any case politically it would never be able to retrench and must regard the provision of employment as an end in itself.

In that case, of course, nothing can be done about size. But even taking the size for granted, there is clearly plenty of room for improvement. Why then has not that improvement been effected? That becomes the next logical question. It cannot be because

of lack of knowledge about how delays can be avoided, policies co-ordinated and decisions made promptly. Surely that is known. No ghost is needed to tell the Government that, not even one from the New World. On these and other matters concerned with the efficiency and integrity of government, detailed advice has been available to the Central and State Governments since at least 1951. Indian Governments are apt to think that in the improvement of administration they can do little without most elaborate changes in the structure. They constantly seek advice about this. The mountain is always in labour and not even a sizable mouse finally appears. The truth of course is that they do not feel upto the steady, difficult grind that would result in good basic administration. That would involve going into thousands of individual cases, laying down a proper system in areas where a system was lacking, and checking aberrations away from it where the system was already elaborated but had in the process of years through idleness or influence been departed from. It would mean taking action against corruption, even when corruption appeared in the form of well-known and partisanly useful politicians. It would mean hard work often but with little to show for it. Why then bother about such unspectacular labour? If, of course, the will were present most useful results could be obtained with the current administration itself. But without the will, there can be no real execution. Against failure of will, even the gods cannot contend. Rightly did the schoolmen say, for the ignorant there is hope; the grace of God can bring enlightenment. But when to ignorance is added overweening conceit, and the will not to learn, no room is there for hope; even the grace of God is helpless.

So in this conceptual jungle the dangerous dens continue to remain trackless. Nor are these dens the only dangers of the jungle. These are the perils of the past, familiar dangers of that have always been. But now new wild animals have emerged, adding yet further to the jungle's terror by their depradations. Some of these were considered tame and useful before. They seem to be acquitting themselves now with a special fierceness, causing the government to quake and its foreign expert adviser Dr. Appleby, to demand their extermination or at the very least, the severest clipping of their claws; you will forgive me for continuing the metaphor; some of you may perhaps agree that it aids the purpose of these talks.

The names of these new, awe-inspiring monsters that have aroused grave apprehension of late are many and varied. There is Audit, there is the Auditor-General, two dreadful nightmares altogether. There are Financial Control and the Financial Adviser, another couple of truly fierce animals. Then think of References to Other Ministries, again, according to present ideas in the Government of India, extremely dangerous and responsible for much damage. Consider next the Public Service Commission, an animal ponderous as a stone-age elephant which sits down in the bed of the stream of due process and dams its flow completely, creating a lake above and leaving dry the river-bed below. There is the ever troublesome Parliament with its Probing Public Accounts Committee, always questioning, raising points, being a nuisance to everyone. And there is also, as if these were not enough, the Lowness of Salaries for the Highest Officials. All these are considered the new, wild animals, recently displaying themselves in their true colours, adding to the old, already sufficient, terrors of the

jungle. Is it any wonder that the jungle seems to grow ever more lawless, and that passing through it now seems to have become a matter of taking one's life in one's hands? Can the wardens really be blamed, if their cries grow shriller and their moans more and more heart-rending and fearful?

In reality, of course, these fresh terrors are somewhat imaginary. Careful examination shows that they do not amount to anything very much. There is no denying that on occasions some of these animals have been unduly fierce. There is also no denying that within their proper spheres they have been, and are, extremely useful. Further, no extraordinary capacity is needed to handle them, in such a way—as indeed they have been handled in the past, when they were sometimes very fierce—that they can be prevented from tearing, raging and rampaging, while at the same time being enabled to fulfil their legitimate functions to the benefit of the public cause. Recently I dealt with these matters elsewhere. Since my remarks probably did not come to the notice of most of you, with your permission I venture to repeat myself.

Take this terrible, plaguing, pre-historic great lizard, References to Other Ministries. I said about it:

"Dr. Appleby makes a great ado about references to other Ministries. They are unnecessary, they hold up work, he says. Now the rules lay down that references should be made only to Ministries that are really concerned with the matter under discussion. If they are so concerned, in any sensible system they must have an opportunity to express their views before a decision is taken. With us the decision is the decision of the Government as a whole,

one for which the responsibility is joint. Each Ministry does not decide for itself and then have a controversy with other Ministries about its decision as in certain system where each Minister is responsible only to the Executive Head and not to the council of his colleagues, that is, the Cabinet, and to Parliament.

Nor indeed must undue delay necessarily follow from references to other Ministries. These, too, can be, and have been, dealt with expeditiously. Where a matter is urgent, there is always the telephone or the personal meeting. Where it is not urgent, all that is needed for prompt disposal is a properly functioning office, with officers willing to check up on delays and make life difficult for recalcitrant or lazy subordinates. If of course, the Minister does not know enough to recognise whether a case has been handled as it should have been or an excuse offered is reasonable, if the Secretary is loath to take action against "passengers" or has fallen into such bad habits that his only movements within his Ministry are from and to his room and that he never spends an hour or two of an afternoon every occasional week visiting the office and checking up on the work of a subordinate selected at random, if the Joint and Deputy Secretaries take their cue from the Secretary and look only at what is put up to them, not bothering about what else there is that should have been dealt with, bad delays there are bound to be. Nor will any amount of Organisation and Methods Charts, useful as they often are as guides, make up for the lack of personal attention by the direct heads."

Consider what is often referred to as the deadening grip of Financial Control. Must this powerful

animal be eliminated if life is to be safe and progressive?

"The Finance Ministry's watchful control over expenditure, essential at all times, just cannot be neglected in a democratic system where Ministers are subject to so many pulls and pressures all the time. That Finance Ministry officials sometimes ask unnecessary questions and thus delay work, is no reason for doing away with this important safeguard. The right course is to improve the ability of such officials, imbuing them with a sense of proportion. Nor, if experience of the past is any guide, should this be particularly difficult. One of the recognised methods of dealing with obstruction from a wrongful use of the Finance Ministry's privilege would be for any Minister who felt aggrieved to take half a dozen instances to the Finance Minister, point out the specific errors in Finance Ministry handling and ask that proper punishment be meted out to those responsible, and clear instructions be issued, so that in future such errors would be avoided. This course requires that the Minister complaining takes considerable pains, but if the work of government is to be done well even Ministers have on occasions to labour arduously. A Finance Minister must be as anxious as any other Minister that the schemes undertaken by the Government should progress, and since he, presumably, being a politician temporarily appointed, can scarcely have developed an undue sense of departmentalism, the result ought to be satisfactory. If it is not, the matter can always be taken to the Cabinet."

What next of that ever-interfering, long-armed, brood, the Financial Advisers? These are senior officers of the Finance Ministry attached to large spending Ministries, principally for the purpose of

speedy disposal. "The Finance Ministry official, being on the spot and fully acquainted with all the working and ideas of the Ministry, should be able to decide quickly on expenditure, for to obtain the orders of the Finance Minister quickly, if the expenditure exceeded his powers. He should also keep the chief officials of the Ministry to which he is attached informed of and in touch with the general policy of the Finance Ministry, thus making of himself a means for ensuring quick and harmonious working. If it is true that he is no longer useful, the reason must be looked for in individuals rather than in the system. Financial Advisers, like Secretaries, are supposed to be men of commonsense and experience, capable of rising above petty considerations and endowed with the ability to see the main points of a problem. If, of course, the contention is that such men can no longer be found, all that can be said is that unless they are, not only this, but no other system of big government can work efficiently. Also that as with brave men after Agamemnon, the breed cannot have died out."

How, further, are those tremendous builders of high hills and raisers of obstacles, Audit and the Auditor-General to be dealt with?

"Instances of the lack of knowledge, poor judgment and unnecessary interference of some audit officers is no reason for reducing the scope or intensity of this most useful function. It may be a good reason for insisting on improving the standards of those officers or for getting rid of them. If the same allegations can be proved against the Auditor-General, it is always open to the Government to convince Parliament, in both Houses of which it is in a large majority, and get rid of him.

The Auditor-General's appointment is one of the most important in the country. Presumably any Government with a sense of responsibility would take very special care in selecting the right person for it. Obviously, then Ministers and secretaries ought not to have any special difficulty in pointing out and discussing with that kind of person specific instances of what they consider divergences from the proper standard that audit ought to observe. Nor, if their contentions are in his opinion correct, ought the Auditor-General to have any special difficulty in issuing remedial instructions to his staff for the future. Independence from any kind of pressure and ability to resist it is, of course, a *sine qua non* for this high office, and the Auditor-General's great care must always be to see that not only is he in fact independent but that he even preserves the appearance of independence in all his dealings. This does not preclude an understanding approach to the real problems of government".

And that all-engulfing octopus-like giant, Parliament? What view should be taken about it ?

"Dr. Appleby's attitude towards Parliament is full of the typical New Deal brains trust contempt of ignorant, bumbling Senators and Congressmen. This is the attitude that has been regarded by many as one of the prime causes of the dislike and distrust of the U.S. Government servant by the American legislature. The U.S. Government has paid dearly for it. Nor is the result likely to be otherwise here if the Government or Government servants adopt anything like a similar view of Parliament. It has, of course, to be remembered that there is a great difference from the point of function between our Parliament and the U.S. Congress. Parliament actually governs through the Cabinet, a committee of the party that has a majority

in it. Naturally, therefore, its members feel a greater responsibility for the actions of the Government than under a system where the legislature is merely the law-making, fund-appropriating and action-reviewing body. Accordingly, members are apt to keep close and continuous watch and sometimes to raise objections in regard to the Government's behaviour which may appear irksome and trifling. The very existence of Question Hour shows that, in the parliamentary system members are intended to take a close interest in the activities of the Government as they take place.

Dr. Appleby would like Parliament not to be too concerned about the Government's acts. Let Parliament pay very little attention to the Auditor-General's reports or the Public Service Commission's views, let it allow the Government as much freedom as possible, let it "look round for things to praise" instead of "looking for things to criticise". In short, he would indulge Parliament by general debates but would try to keep it away from the particular. In somewhat peculiar phraseology he demands "Will the people and Parliament be sufficiently willing to pay enough and to give through delegation sufficient scope for the discretion and wisdom providing the kind of public service of performance necessary for administrative efficiency ?"

About delegation, it may be said that while Parliament must of course act with a sense of proportion and a willingness to give credit for *bona fides* unless there is strong reason to believe otherwise, it cannot abdicate its responsibility both to watch continuously the working of the Government and to raise such points as may seem to it to need attention from time to time. To keep the Government up to the mark in small things as well as great, to question injustice and

oppression by the Executive, whether these be large or small, must remain some of the main functions of Parliament, whatever foreign experts may say. The two Houses of Parliament offer the most effective platform for getting the Government to realize its errors and its faults and members of Parliament would be failing in their duty if, following Dr. Appleby, they spent most of their time waving palm branches and singing Hosanna ! Many, alas, are even now only too prone to shrink before authority and fold hands in subjection, whatever their real judgment and feeling. It would indeed be a misfortune were their number to increase".

Finally, what about this greatly dreaded monster, Low Salaries for the Highest Servants ? Does it exist or is it just mythical ?

"On payment, too, Dr. Appleby's view is completely out of accord with both the reality of the situation and the spirit of the times. Rs. 4,000 a month seems a mere pittance to him. Its buying power, in 1939 terms, has, he says sadly, shrunk very greatly. Quite true, but then so has the buying power of the rupee for all, not least for the agricultural labourer, the industrial worker and the lower-middle-classes. The policy laid down in the Constitution and accepted by the Government is also reduction of inequalities. Moreover, despite the fall in buying power and the increase in taxation, on Rs. 4,000 a month most people can lead quite a comfortable life. Even in terms of U. S. currency, Rs.4,000 a month, about $10,000 a year is by no means negligible. Not very many civil servants there get much more than that, while the minimum income is hardly ever below $2,500 a year".

In addition to all those we have met upto now, there is one other wild animal stalking the jungle which

seems truly frightening to many. This is the vague feeling in the minds of those in power that the general administrator, the official selected through an open competitive examination who upto now has been the key figure in the system, is not really adequate for the tasks of modern administration. In Delhi this feeling is at its highest. The Government finds it cannot do without the official. He is its principal bearer of burdens, but some of its chief men all the time feel unhappy about using him. They wish they could make some change, if only to set their own impress on the system. If only they knew how ! Even change for the sake of change would be welcome. The instrument of a self-governing democracy they feel ought somehow to be very different from that which functioned under the previous regime. It is almost shocking that it continues to do the work required of it so well that to do away with it appears on any ground very inexpedient.

Antagonism to the general administrator is also to be found among some academicians. Three reasons account for this. There is the dislike of the expert for what he considers the non-expert, and often therefore the superficial mind in high places, especially in places which enable it to advise the ultimate makers of policy about the opinions of the expert. There is the view that the general administrator is apt to form a separate caste, to think of himself and his associates as distinct from the people and therefore, to look down upon them. There is the idea that because of what is regarded as his privileged position, he arouses great resentment in the minds of other government servants.

The expert naturally likes to feel that when he is putting up a proposal or making a suggestion it

is being considered by somebody who knows at least as much as he does about his subject. I remember many years ago being on a deputation to an International Conference, on which were also several distinguished and able economists. When discussions had reached a crucial point, we asked these experts to put down their views, so that within the deputation opinion could be clarified. Their answer was "It is just no use. You wouldn't understand. Leave it to us". Our Chairman was a tough and experienced lawyer, accustomed to get at facts by cross-examination, and he said, "True, we may not understand the details of economic theories but we do have some commonsense, you know. Put down whatever you have to say and then answer the questions we put to you." With much reluctance and obvious dislike, they did, and after a while, to their great surprise, they found that not only were we able to understand what they were saying but could even stress the flaws in their arguments. It is natural, however, for experts to feel that they are the possessors of a special mystery which ought only to be examined by others who share that mystery. And so, some academicians like some politicians would prefer in place of the wide-spread general administrator animal, something else. What exactly that something should be, they are hardly ever able to say. Almost all prefer not to go beyond vague notions.

Let us consider the other objections. That the general administrator did become a person apart and was inclined to regard himself as standing somewhat away from the society around him, was true in the past. Now, of course, this attitude has generally disappeared. From what I have seen in most parts of the the country, there is very great participation in ordinary life, sometimes even perhaps more than is

healthy in the public interest. It must not be forgotten that impartiality is still extremely important for any official, who after all is generally a full-time permanent public servant with public responsibilities to discharge. Once participation is allowed to overwhelm impartiality, injustice follows. In many cases then private virtue gains ascendency over public virtue. And with almost all of us in this country, private virtue is indeed extremely powerful. Private virtue means looking after those with whom one is connected by birth, or brought into intimate contact by circumstance, generally at the cost of the public as a whole. Public virtue means regarding everybody alike, dealing with problems on their merits, no matter who is blessed or hurt or how. I think you will agree that in the long run public virtue has to be given precedence by the official, paid from the funds of the public. At the same time, undoubtedly, participation is very desirable, and no effort to achieve it should be spared, it always being understood that it is not to be carried to the point of conflict with duty.

The third charge against the general administrator, specially in the higher ranks, is that he arouses the resentment of other Government servants. One of the reasons, it is said, is that all the really important jobs go to him. Another, that he takes great pride in his position and is sometimes inclined to be off-handed with colleagues on other tasks, although individually they might be better in their own work than he is in his. Since he is the man who according to the governmental set up, is in general co-ordinative charge, this may perhaps still happen. Conditions now, of course, are very different but this was a charge levelled often in the past

and with justice. It was really the bane of the senior civil service of the past, the I. C. S., that many of its members carried about with them an atmosphere of superiority and seemed, for no very good reason, to look down upon everyone else. Some of the aura of that air of effortless superiority has perhaps descended to its successors in the I. A. S. and may be working to their detriment.

Sometimes I feel that one solution of this particular problem might be the omission of all service designations. If you did not place after people's names, the initials I.A.S., I.P.S., I.F.S. or the abbreviation for whatever other service they belonged to, they might regard themselves as just government servants doing particular classes of jobs. The effect of that might be that no one would think of himself as belonging to a higher class, or rather a higher order, than another. At the same time, these appendages have great value in fostering tradition, So that it is really a question of weighing the advantages and disadvantages. It may well be that the whole morale of a body of men doing most important work is tied up psychologically with the act that they are publicly called by a certain name, and accordingly certain standards and modes of behaviour are expected from them. The aroma so to speak which goes with the name, while sometimes offensive to other nostrils, may make all the difference in difficult circumstances. It is a complex problem. In any case, what is extremely desirable is that men who belong to important services should make a point of convincing themselves that the fact of their service or position does not give them any right to feel superior in any way. If the conviction is supported by constant self-examination of thought

and behaviour from this point of view, the charge may soon come to be ragarded as groundless and cease to be made.

Our parliamentary system of Government, our conception of the rule of law, rights of the subject etc., have been adopted almost entirely from the United Kingdom. Accordingly that country is, in many ways, the research laboratory for many of the administrative problems that arise, to the extent that we need such a laboratory. There, no large section of opinion has any doubt about the necessity for the general administrator, the desirability of maintaining his class and getting administrative problems solved through him and with his assistance. Said the Northcote Trevelyan Report of 1846, "We believe that men who have been engaged upto two or one and twenty, with studies which have no immediate connection with the business of any profession, of which the immediate effect is merely to open, to invigorate and to enrich the mind will generally be found in the business of every profession", note the word every, "every profession, superior to men who have at 18 to 19 devoted themselves to the special duties of their calling". This still remains their rule, and they select their principal civil servants accordingly.

There is also much wisdom in the quotation below from Sir Oswym Murray, who retired as Permanent Under Secretary to the Navy. Talking to a body of young men, he said "We hear too much now-a-days about the impossibility of fitting a square peg into a round hole. The world will not carve a hole to fit each one of you. What your education should be doing is to enable you to fit into any hole for which the world needs you." That is

what the general administrator should be by reason of his education, capable of fitting into any hole for which he is needed. And the last Permanent Under-Secretary of the treasury, Sir Edward Bridges, who recently retired, points out that "When a man has done 5 jobs in 15 years and has done them all with a measure of success, he is afraid of nothing, and welcomes change. He has learned the art of spotting what points are crucial for forming a judgment on a disputed question, even when he has the most cursory knowledge of the subject as a whole". The important thing of course is this ability to know what points are crucial for forming a judgment on any disputed question. You may not know very much about the subject, but if you have a certain amount of intelligence and the flair which is developed through holding a series of appointments successfully, you are really quite capable of handling most problems, except the purely technical. It may, of course, be that you have done not too well in several appointments over a period of years, and are incapable of handling anything new. But if you are like that, more often than not, you will have been found out long before you have finished the five.

One proof of the usefulness of the general administrator in these matters is the great anxiety of hard headed business-men to get experienced general administrators into their organisations. This is true both in Britain and in this country. Now most business-men always tell an outsider "Ours is a very difficult job." Their inclination is to make quite a mystery of it and to expand on the difficulties of understanding the intricacies of its techniques. Whether it is stock exchange transactions or the making of clocks, the

running of a cement factory or the overseeing of a bank, all have their own special ways of management and their own jargons, and to every businessman the task on which he is engaged is the most risky and arduous. But if he can find a good general administrator, he will have no hesitation in giving him twice the highest salary that man got in service in order to take him over. Some of the biggest banks in Britain are being run by former British and Indian Civil servants. So, too, are quite a number of other concerns. Recently I myself have had some experience on this point. A very distinguished specialist, a man of great attainments and reputation was placed in charge of an institution with which I happened to be connected. Despite all his specialised skill, which should have given him a great advantage in this particular line, he made, to say the least, a complete mess. He was succeeded by a general administrator of experience, but one who had certainly no comparable qualification or attainments. Yet the work goes much better; efficiency has become perceptible and results are beginning to appear. So it would seem that specialisation is not everything and that it is not only possible but also advisable, if you have a particular policy, to carry it out with the general administrator. Except for purely technical matters, such as building a house, or being the manager of a mill—the manager not the general supervisor or director—where you have to have recourse to distinct, technical knowledge, the general administrator is likely to be always useful.

In any case there is no substitute for him in the present system. Under our constitution and the British constitution you see again and again that the expert cannot proceed unless he has obtained the assent of

the layman. Your Parliament is lay. If you are a Doctor, your patient is lay. He has to be convinced that you can cure him or at least do something for him, before he will consent to be operated on or treated by you, and the man to explain this to him is not you, speaking in medical terms but ordinary people like him, relatives etc., who will tell him that it can be done. And that is one of the functions which in our system, the general administrator has to fulfil in regard to Ministers. There is no alternative in fact if what is desired is "an efficient body of permanent officers occupying a position duly sub-ordinate to that of a Minister, yet possessing sufficient independence, character, ability and experience to be able to advise, assist and to some extent, influence those who are from time to time set above them". It will be readily conceded that it is very necessary that those who have the ultimate power of decision should be able to call upon such advisers.

A true monster, which stalks unabashed through the Jungle, but to which no reference has been made in either of the lists we have dealt with upto now, is what is commonly termed Bureaucracy. Properly speaking, it is not Bureaucracy but rather its misuse, since Bureaucracy is inevitable wherever there is a government. For what does Bureaucracy mean? Its six primary criteria, according to well-known authority are: differentiation of functions, qualifications for office, a hierarchical organisation and discipline, objectivity of method, precision and consistency involving the keeping of records and adherence to rules, and the preservation of secrecy in regard to certain aspects of government. When you have an autocratic personal Government, it may be

possible to do without Bureaucracy. Then you decide each matter as you think fit, on its own merit or against its own merit, and you can decide three similar cases in three different ways without anybody being able to press any particular objection. But in a democracy, or in any big Government, even under an autocracy, where there has to be delegation of powers and differentiation of functions, you cannot do without Bureaucracy. At the same time, Bureaucracy suffers from very great maladies. Professor Robson, who I believe, lectured here in your city some years ago, in his recent book sums up these maladies thus: "an excessive sense of self-importance on the part of officials or an undue idea of the importance of their office: an indifference towards the feelings or the convenience of individual citizens; an obsession with the binding and inflexible authority of departmental decisions, precedents, arrangements or forms, regardless of how badly and with what injustice they may work in individual cases; a mania for regulations and formal procedure; a preoccupation with the activities of particular units of the administration and an inability to consider the government as a whole; a failure to recognize the relations between the governors and the governed as an essential part of the democratic process".

I do not think we shall be wrong in saying that we see many examples of these maladies in this country. What is the remedy for these maladies? Proper control by political superiors. And by the political superiors of the political superiors, the People. It has been said that Ministers exist in order to tell the civil servant how far he can go without being hung on a lamp post. The Minister

is there to say, "this cannot or must be done; consider public opinion, it is not just a matter of following a system". The people can exercise proper control by expressing their views freely through meetings, demonstrations, criticisms, by raising individual cases concerning grave injustices that have been done, and so forth. The Press in India, unfortunately, assists to a much smaller degree than it should in the exercise of proper control, because of its diffidence in criticising the politician as well as the official, especially on specific and particular matters. Politicians of the governing party and Ministers ought not however to need the impetus of the Press. There is nothing, of course, to show that the general administrator suffers more from these maladies than other officials. Moreover, whatever the past position, that now he is under full political control, is undoubted.

The maladies of bureaucracy sometimes flourish quite independently of the official because the politician himself develops some of them. The most common is an excessive sense of self importance though some of the others are not unknown. When this happens, he can scarcely exercise proper control over his subordinates. If the custodian himself is false to his trust, who shall keep watch over him? One of the objections to the ideas that Delhi sedulously attempts to propagate that Parliament ought not to be critical, that Parliament should largely approve, that it should praise all the time and not emphasize weaknesses, is that they are exactly contrary to the correct theory, for the only effective check on the Minister is Parliament. This particular view in fact would seem to be the result of Ministers having

been infected to some extent with the maladies of Bureaucracy.

There would seem to be a great deal more justification in the complaint about the constant thinking of officials regarding status and emoluments. Many officials are apt to consider getting-on, the be-all and end-all of existence. Work certainly takes second place with them. They are always thinking of what will happen and how it will happen. I remember many years ago a colleague of mine from your state, Bihar, saying one day when we were talking about conditions in the Provinces, how before he came to Delhi, it never occurred to him to be anxious about when he was going to be promoted or what his next job would be, much less about trying for this or that appointment and how the attitude of mind of almost all the contemporaries he could think of was similar. There they were, they know they would get what was their right, and they did not bother and worry and plan and intrigue, but did their jobs and that was all. He was a good man of whom I thought highly. He is still in service and having remembered him, I wish him many years of undiminished health and intellectual and moral integrity. That frame of mind, of not striving for this, or that, not going around, not speaking to so and so, doing one's work with will and spirit, and just letting things happen as they will, is undoubtedly much rarer. It is very desirable that is should become common. It can only be so if the true value of good work done, whatever its nature, is emphasized and appreciated. In a system where some posts carry more authority than other and the rewards for undertaking responsibilities in them are greater, it becomes inevitable that those below should try

to rise to them and to regard them as prizes well worth having. There is nothing wrong in that. What is essential, however, is that it should be, if not impossible, at least extremely difficult, for high posts to be reached on any consideration except that of merit. This particular normally impenetrable lair then can best be rendered innocuous by the example of the behaviour of those holding high political office. That is the only remedy for it.

In this connection let us digress for a moment to the honours system foisted upon the country three or four years ago. Such a system seems to me totally unworthy of a state which calls itself a democratic socialist republic, and the constitution of which lays special emphasis on fraternity and egalitarianism. We have not the excuse the British have of being heirs to an ancient aristocratic tradition and the proper comparison for us should be not with France, where they merely continue an old practice or with the totalitarian autocratic U. S. S. R., which whatever its professions, in practice cherishes and encourages among its people inequalities, but with comparatively new democratic self-governing countries like Canada and Australia, which despite the fact that the British tradition of Honours had been firmly establisihed in them went out of their way to request that no honours should be bestowed on their citizens. Yet every Republic Day we have announcement of honours. In fact, we are back again to the King's birthday list. What purpose do these honours serve? None at all. They only arouse a kind of competition and a spirit of rivalry among those who are mean-minded. But assuming that you have to have this kind of a system, the least that can be expected is that honours bestowed should be only for especially notable work.

Take an example from the last honours list, which came out day before yesterday. I personally like Pandit Pant. He has often seemed to me the prototype in these days of the old Gladstonian Liberal, the kind of person who really studies—very few of our politicians or our Ministers do unfortunately—the kind of person who takes your mind back to Ranade, Gokhale or Pherozshah Mehta, so what I say should not be misunderstood. I wish him well, but when I am told that on the basis of the splendid work done by him in regard to the re-organisation of states, when that is made the ground for awarding the highest honour to him, I am quite taken aback. For as a citizen of Bombay I say to myself, what was this splendid work? Large numbers of people killed in the streets of Bombay, lesser numbers in those of Ahmedabad, riots all over the state, the minds of the people distracted for many months! And all because of what? An attitude of cold superiority on the part of those in authority. If the Government was determined to reject the logical linguistic solution of Mahagujrat and Maharastra with Bombay, the solution adopted finally could have been adopted the moment the report was presented. The solution was the adding of Vidharba, which the Commission had suggested should be separated, to the rest of the composite Bombay state. Had that been done immediately the report came out, there would have been no trouble. Had that been done two months later, the trouble would have been settled. Had that been done even four months later, the extent of the trouble would have been minimised. But it was resisted and continued to be resisted. When therefore we are told that state reorganisation was the definite, successful work for which Pandit Pant is being honoured, it seems obv-

iously unreasonable and wrong. This is not following the rule of rewarding the deserving. I may have spoken with some heat on this point. When your fellow citizens' lives have been lost because of thoroughly futile political manoeuvres, it is difficult to restrain indignation. Again, if you distribute your awards to people whose anti-social activities are notorious, you surely are not setting an example of honouring the deserving. The true jungle forces are likely to be strengthened by such acts and not reduced.

To sum up, if it is desired to convert this seemingly difficult administrative jungle into a pleasant park, the ambition, I submit, should be Character, not Office, Character to see things as they are, and in the light of what is seen, to do that which is necessary, bringing into exercise that finest type of courage which is the habitual suppression of temperamental fears.

LECTURE II

The Happy Warrior and the Safe Path

Last night I endeavoured to show that the Administrative Jungle was not such a jungle that with proper handling it could not be turned into a park, and that what was really lacking was the proper handling. At the same time, I pointed out that unless the wardens themselves were prepared to learn to think and act appropriately such handling would indeed be difficult.

To-day we are dealing with, what one may term, the administrator proper, the man who can meet the responsibilities of his tasks in a manner which is best suited to serve the public interest as well as to enable him to fulfil them happily. Obviously, we must first consider the nature of the overall task. What should be the administrator's, nay the government's, main endeavour in the India of to-day? I should say that it is to assist democracy on a federal model to achieve the transformation of a vast impoverished and under-developed country into a prosperous welfare state; and in so doing not to depart from that tradition of tolerance and non-regimentation which links this country to the rest of the democratic free world.

You will note there, first of all, the emphasis on democracy. What kind of democracy? A federal democracy with federated units and a centre. This democracy functions in an enormous country of 36 crore people, undoubtedly one of the poorest countries in the world, and under-developed, with plentiful res-

ources, material and human, but underdeveloped both in skills and in technical achievements. What is it that ~~which~~ we want for this country? Prosperity. But not mere prosperity in the sense of being rich. We want a prosperous state which is also a welfare state, that is, a state which considers the social objectives just as important as the economic. Further this prosperous Welfare State must be attained and maintained without regimentation. The wide tolerance which has been the peculiar feature of this country in all kinds of circumstances, fortunate and unhappy, must also continue. On no account do we wish to lose that.

At this stage, perhaps it will be useful to enumerate briefly certain aspects of the task and the implications from them which have to be taken into consideration in all administration related to the purpose of attaining the objectives. The democratic set-up involves an understanding of the electorate, the legislature and the Minister and of the proper and existing—they are not necessarily the same—relationships among them. It necessitates reflection on the administrator's own place in the scheme of things, so that he neither exceeds nor withdraws. Federation demands consideration of the respective rights and obligations of the Centre and the States, of the responsibilities of Planning for the country as a whole, of the problems and conflicts that may arise from either over-centralisation or excessive decentralisation, of the structure and constitution of government services. The under-developed nature of the country means a plunge into the whole field of economics, with special application to the economics of growth, and an understanding of the respective position and possibilities of agriculture and industry,

the rural and the urban sides of the country's life, the calculation and mobilisation of resources, the nature and probabilities of saving and the complexities of foreign exchange. Increase of Wealth and Equitable Distribution lead further and perhaps more concretely into the economic and social fields. Irrigation, Credit, Marketing, Community Projects, Extension Schemes, Nationalised Enterprises, the Public and Private Sectors, Taxation, Subsidies, Unemployment Insurance are but a few of the most important matters that arise from this aspect. The maintenance of the tradition of Tolerance and Non-Regimentation means that there is no 'quick' way to development though imposition of ideas by liquidation of opponents and the tyrannical use of superior force and cunning. It means taking the people along, while permitting full freedon of criticism and opposition within the law. It means the full acceptance of Milton's famous plea "Give me the liberty to know, to utter, to argue, freely according to Conscience, above all liberties". It means understanding combined with firmness of resolve on the part of Government and honesty and responsiveness on the part of the administrator. It means, on the part of both, obtaining through deeds, sufficient confidence to make true the saying that in a democracy the Government leads and the people co-operate.

Since, of recent years, there has been quite a tendency in this country, a tendency unfortunately far from discouraged by Government, to go whoring after strange gods, it is perhaps worthwhile to examine the question of regimentation and egaliterianism in somewhat greater detail. The model for regimentation is the U. S. S. R., with Communist China coming very near.

The U. S. S. R. is the homeland of the Communist faith. It is also the central shrine to which Communists throughout the world turn for inspiration, guidance and instruction. It has been under the sway of the Communists for 40 years. Here, if anywhere Communist principles have had the fullest chance of being worked out. The U. S. S. R. should accordingly by now present the best example of an egalitarian State. Are the citizens of the U. S. S. R. politically or economically equal? Has, in any case such equality made great strides among them? "No" is the answer every impartial observer is compelled to give. Officially classes have been abolished. But very substantial differences prevail. The Communists are apt to find in economic conditions the motive power of all society. Considering then, economic inequalities first, we find a small group at the top, an elite which holds all the real power and runs the system, enjoying an extremely high standard of life. As against this, forced labour, the 'slave' of the Soviet system, has, until very recently, when there has been some reduction in numbers, been estimated at between 10 to 15 million men. These are kept in labour or concentration camps and employed on public works. Their control and supervision are entrusted to the Secret Police, which has a special industrial branch for this purpose. These men own nothing beyond the clothes supplied to them by the Police authorities. Their food is generally very coarse and often insufficient. Between these two extremes, are three classes, the peasants, the town proletariat and the new middle classes, including the bulk of the bureaucrats. Most peasants are, of course, tied to collective farms and it would appear that their treatment in the past has led to so great a deterioration that the

Government has had to hold out special inducements in the hope of better results in future. For several agricultural commodities, production has fallen even lower than it was in 1928. In considering the peasants it has to be remembered that the seizure of grain and cattle to feed the towns in Lenin's time caused a very severe famine during which it is estimated over 3 million died and that Stalin himself admitted that in order to make his collective farms work, 10 million more had to be blotted out. The economic condition of the proletariat in towns, considerably smaller in number than the peasants, is better than that of the peasants but not to a very substantial extent. The real inheritors of the advantages of the system, next to the elite, would seem to be the new middle-classes, the few million people who make up the 'managerial' class and their families. These are government employees of the middle and higher ranks, factory managers, technicians, army officers etc. Their standard of living is much higher than that of the proletariat and the peasant, though definitely below that of the elite. Clearly, then, there is no economic equality in the U. S. S. R. In fact, some observers hold that the inequalities under the Communist system are greater than those in many other countries of the world.

Politically, too, the position would seem to be the same. In theory, every citizen has a vote and is equal to every other citizen. In reality, a very small minority over which the people have no authority controls everything. This small minority is, in turn, ruled by a tiny group of men, the Politburo, answerable so far as can be seen only to itself. The voter may exercise his vote at elections but he can only

do so in favour of the candidates put up by the party. There can be no other candidates. The legislature so elected is in effect an approving body, its business to approve such of the actions taken by the executive as the executive wishes to have approved. Members of the Communist Party, under its Politburo, have a very different status and power from that of the ordinary citizen.

It is sometimes urged that in view of the deplorably low economic condition of our poorest classes, the establishment of a Communist regime is a thing to be encouraged for it cannot lead to worsening and may lead to betterment. Those who argue in this fashion neglect the realities of the change. It is indeed wrong, something to be corrected with the greatest speed possible, that the least-privileged amongst us do not get enough to eat. But at any rate, we have no labour-camps, where citizens turned into slaves are forcibly put to work for the benefit of the state, fed badly and treated harshly until worn-out, they grow prematurely old and collapse. The law is not with us an instrument for carrying out the wishes of the government or the ruling party nor are our judges weapons in the hands of the Government for imposing the punishments it desires. Our policemen have no power to detain persons at will for long periods or make them just disappear. A strike by labourers or workmen is among us no treason, nor is the trade union, the organisation for the protection of the rights of the workers, compelled to be "an apparatus" of the Government, a "transmission-belt" to carry out Government's behests upon the workers. Apart from the exploitation of natural resources, the warlike strength of the Soviet regime has been built up on the hardship it has im-

posed on the bulk of its people including the poorest. Tremendous effort has been insisted on while the standard of living has been kept low. Our poor, it is said, have nothing to lose but their hunger. Would it be to their advantage if so far from losing it, they found themselves in addition with heavy chains on their feet and hands? Would it be to their advantage if they even lost a very little of it and found themselves in return with heavy chains on their feet and hands?

Having said this, let us turn back to the Indian task. It and its implications are in a way terrifying in their significance. Yet its responsibilities have to be tackled fully, or at least in large part, by all senior administrators, and to a certain extent, by all concerned with the administration. The idea that a sharp line of division can be drawn, with policy on one side and implementation or administration on the other, is in fact impractical. The two merge together a great deal. If the administrator cannot go ahead without the policy decider, the policy decider too cannot act or operate without the administrator. Some policy deciders, of course, may choose to operate in a vacuum, but when they do they generally make very gross errors, and nobody would consider them examples to follow. The wise policy decider has to have the data and views of the administrators as at least part of the material on which he can come to a conclusion.

Various authorities have commented on this very close relation between policy and administration. One of the earliest manuals dealing with the duties and the functions of the administrator is that of Sir Henry Taylor. Its subject matter is more administration than statecraft but so close in his thought was

the connection between the two that he preferred to call it "The Statesman". The wise, he says, have always been aware that the essence of policy is the execution of it. In other words, there is not much point in declarations of policy, unless you really can execute them. Execution naturally brings in the administrator.

When the well-known political and economic writer, Walter Bagehot, thought of William Pitt, one of the greatest Prime Ministers of England, the figure that rose before his mind's eye was that of the administrator. Says he: "A really great administrator thinks not only of the day but of the morrow; does not only what he must but what he wants; is eager to extirpate every abuse and on the watch for every improvement; is on a level with the highest political thought of his time—and persuades his age to be ruled according to it—to permit him to embody it in policy and in laws. Administration in this large sense is concerned with the far-seeing regulation of future conduct as well as with the limited management of the present". You will agree that however narrow some of the particular tasks of administration may seem, basically it is in this large sense that its consideration is most useful for us. The 'limited management of the present' is undoubtedly inportant. It must be done efficiently. But without "the far-seeing regulation of future conduct", in our circumstances, it leads nowhere.

Having come so far let us ask ourselves, what is the key then to the problems of administration? Is there any single thing which can really be a guide, a solution, a weapon that will cut through its Gordian Knots, and smooth the way to progress? Bagehot hints at it in his definition. He says "the administrator is eager to extirpate every abuse and is on the watch for every improvement". This is important.

But it is not necessary to rely only on Bagehot. Let us turn to the wisdom of Ancient India. The eminent Sanskritist, Mackenzie Brown, ends his book on Indian political thought "The White Umbrella" thus: "The personal integrity of the ruler and the moral sense of the citizenry are the keys to sound Government and prosperous society. No trick of administrative technique or organisation, no constitutional devices or amendments can save a government or a state lacking these essentials. And for that polity which possesses these, state machinery is of secondary importance. (This does not mean that you can do without state machinery, but that as compared with the basic integrity of the ruler and the moral sense of the people, it is less important). Such, at least, is the attitude of the Hindu theorists. Although this heritage has many facets and apparent contradictions, the core of the tradition is essentially this: The problem of government is the ethical problem of the individual projected into the field of the state." That seems to me to be put very happily, and so far as I am concerned, correctly. It really gives the key. "The problem of government is the ethical problem of the individual projected into the field of the state." And he goes on to add, 'Its solution lies in Dharma." This Dharma naturally is not dogma or orthodoxy. It is Vyas termed Dharma, that is righteousness, right-doing.

Briefly then, the real answer to all the problems of administration, complicated and difficult as they are, is right-doing. But how does the administrator know what is right? How is he able to say this is right and that is wrong? For the modern administrator, there is only one answer. He cannot fall back on authority. There is only one person he can turn

to, himself, and to that which is the most important element in him, his reason. His reason can tell him what is right and what is wrong. It has been said by some philosophers that reason is very frail. The mind of man has been compared to a stormy sea studded with treacherous cliffs, with on its surface a few weak boats floating, trying to find their way to port, always in danger of being dashed against the cliffs and overturned. Passions and biases are "the sea and cliffs while the feeble boats represent reason. This view of reason makes it clear that not only is it not powerful, but it is quite weak. Yet it is the only element in man's composition that enables him to understand things, to look at and examine life without fear. It alone can counteract the many biases and prejudices that without it give so much of a twist to human thinking. Many eminent people are inclined to laugh at objectivity. They hold that however desirable, it is just not possible to attain it. Yet to the extent that human beings attempt to move towards it, the animating factor is Reason.

Some of you will have read Bertrand Russel's book on Bolshevism. You will remember, it originally came out in 1920-21. The last edition was published in 1946 and in the preface to that he said he did not wish to change anything. Now he seems definitely a reasonable person. You will remember that fine passage in which he says, "I do not know whether Bolshevism can be prevented from acquiring universal power. But, even if it cannot, I am persuaded that those who stand out against it, not from love of ancient injustice, but in the name of the free spirit of Man, will be the bearers of the seeds of progress, from which, when the world's gestation is accomplished, new life will be born." His reason prevents

him from going over to that side, however powerful. Why? His reason tells him that the cruelty, the wickedness, the unkindness that is inherent in the system is bound to continue and reproduce itself however strong it becomes. It is not because he dislikes it as of itself. It is not because he has any prejudice against it. He is himself greatly in favour of real socialism. But he argues it out on the basis of the actual results as he sees them, and he judges accordingly.

And that brings us to the poem that gives part of the title to this lecture. Wordsworth asks, "Who is the Happy Warrior?" and answers

> "'It is he whose law is Reason; who depends
> Upon that law as on the best of friends?'".

Then going on to a description of a condition of affairs and a corollary from the making of Reason the law, adds:

> "Whence, in a state where men are tempted still
> To evil for a guard against worse ill,
> And what in quality or act is best
> Doth seldom on a right foundation rest,
> He labours good on good to fix, and owes
> To virtue every triumph that he knows."

The administrator must rely not upon the temporary make-believe, deceptive expedient but must get down to the right foundation to which he is led by Reason and must build upon it. But why should Reason lead him to right conclusions? What special lessons has Reason to teach the administrator whose actions affect the lives and welfare of many men? In a way of course a ward-guardian relation subsists between them and him. He is at the same time a fellow citizen and a guardian.

The first lesson Reason teaches the administrator is to realise, not just as one of the things that is, but in an effective, personal way, the transitoriness of life. It drives forcibly home to him that he, together with all other human beings, is a prisoner under a sentence of death with an indefinite reprieve. For him, as for any one else, death could come at any minute. I could die this second. All of us might die if the roof fell on top of us. And there is no impossibility in such things happening. Accidents are not uncommon occurrences. This being so, is there any point, says Reason to the administrator, in the folly of mean and evil deeds, of unworthy short-term triumphs, of envying, of pursuing with hatred, of rising by intrigue or cringing, of falling below one's standards for success? To what end, asks Reason. Is there any point in going out of one's way inappropriately, or prejudicially to others, in order to gain promotion or honours and rise in status? Reason, arguing on this basis, brings a sense of proportion to the administrator's life, clearly showing him what is important and how, and giving him, if he will let it, that strength, courage and calmness that will enable him to meet "equal to the need" any "awful moment" the Fates may bring.

The labourer is worthy of his hire. Certainly, says Reason. But it proceeds to tell the administrator that in a country where the average per capita annual income is about Rs. 290, his emoluments too have to be very moderate. There must be no attempt to perpetuate historical anomalies, nor to argue from the practices of far richer countries. Reason agrees that such emoluments may involve very modest living conditions. That, however, it feels must be borne, and without overmuch complaint, since no one realises

better than the good administrator that he exists for and because of the people. Reason, in fact, relies upon him with his high standards and sense of duty to set an example in the avoidance of wasteful, ostentatious and conspicuous consumption, especially at the public cost. The Ministers, both at the Centre and the States, recent arrivals in high places, have not shown that they are alive to their responsibilities in this matter. They seem to rejoice in large expenditure of public funds for purposes of show and prestige as well as for their own comfort and well-being. Reason tells the administrator firmly to set his face against this tendency and to the extent that he can, even at the risk of some unpopularity, to draw attention in every possible case to the first canon of financial properiety that no person entrusted with public funds shall spend them in any manner in which a truly prudent person would hesitate to spend his own money. On the analogy of the old saying "When change is not necessary, it is not necessary to change" a new one of special significance to governmental finance might read, "When spending is not necessary, it is not necessary to spend", the term 'necessary' being interpreted strictly by the administrator in the light of the real needs of the country and not in those of creating impressions. One other duty in this connection falls upon the administrator, that of bringing down for the common good the wholly artificial levels of incomes and earnings in the higher ranks of the private sector, which enable a very small proportion of the population to lead lives of great luxury.

One of our misfortunes in recent years has been that while the ability and experience of the senior administrator remains, his independence has dwindled

greatly. The relationship into which he has fallen with the Minister is reminiscent more of the servant-master connection than of the senior-junior colleague, engaged on a common task, that it ought to be. He is accordingly unable to take the stand his duty renders imperative when he disagrees and says "I think this. It seems to me you are going wrong. Of course, I am quite prepared to obey orders but would you kindly consider the view I put forward. Perhaps then you may think differently." There are very few officials now indeed who will take this attitude and in many spheres the result is most disadvantageous to the country. The great administrative sage Confucius asked many centuries ago—it is remarkable how in administration you find often the same problems and the same answers, whether it is 2,000 years ago or to-day, probably because basically the question is of human beings dealing with one another in certain relationships—Confucius said "Can there be loyalty without admonition? Can there be love without advice?" So however profound the loyalty to a superior and however deep the respect and affection for him, the corresponding obligation of admonition and advice remains. Fortunate the superior who realises and appreciates this? But whether he does or not, Reason enjoins this line of action on the administrator. The discussion on this point may well end with another anecdote about Confucius. Duke Ting asked if there was any one phrase that could ruin a country. Master K'ung (Confucius) replied: "No phrase could ever be like that, but here is one that comes near it. 'What pleasure is there in being a prince unless one can say whatever one chooses and no one dares to disagree?' So long as what he says is good, it is good also that he should not be opposed. But

if what he says is bad, will it not come very near to his ruining his country by a single phrase?''

Reason goes on to suggest that in view of the complexity of the tasks to be faced, continuous study is essential if work is to be well done. For it says, unless you are equipped, unless you have the data and even the theory, your work will suffer. The data naturally includes knowledge of the men the administrator is dealing with and how to get the best out of them. The study of mankind is obviously important for the administrator, but it sometimes degenerates into a study merely of the weaker sides of men, especially of men in superior positions, so as to be able to bring leverage upon their lower impulses. More often than not, then it is liable to be used for personal advantage.

Reason further tells the administrator that in this mass of unreason which is our world, his duty is mainly straightening. Government itself should, in fact, be a process of straightening that which is crooked and awry in the outer surroundings as well as in the inner heart of man. The administrator must avoid crookedness in himself, so that he may be enabled to set things straight for others. Reason brings this clearly in front of him. Briefly it teaches him to be unwordly without being a saint. It tells him to be unambitious without being inactive, and to be warm-hearted without being sentimental. Through good report and ill, it urges him to work on following the light of the truth as he sees it. For, says Reason, there is nothing else to be done that is worthy of him. Scepticism, it encourages, but not to such an extent as to paralyse. The administrator who takes reason for his guide is not likely to accept things too easily, but because he

does not accept them, therefore, he must not fall into the opposite error of passiveness. Reason leaves him content to know what is knowable and to reserve judgment on what is not, so that it saves him from being dogmatic and simultaneously urges him forward to grasp whatever it is possible to learn.

Men are apt to interpret privileges, rewards and honours according to their natures. But there is one which is unequalled. It is that which a good conscience bestows upon its owner. Edmund Burke termed it the sunshine of the soul, and he thought no other distinction, no other reward could compare with it. This is the gift Reason bestows upon the administrator for it shows him what is right and leads him to do it. When he has won this gift it matters little how fierce the outer storm. He can always outface it.

The Chairman suggested that I should not speak too long to-day so that you could devote an hour or more to questions on what I said yesterday as well as to-day. As in duty bound, I accept his suggestion, and shall endeavour to answer, to your satisfaction I hope, the many questions I understand you wish to ask. I am sorry if part of what I said to-day sounded rather like a sermon. It was not intended to be that. At the same time, the fact remains that there are certain fundamentals, and that, particularly for the good administrator, if these fundamentals are lacking, all the rest is waste.

LIST OF OTHER PUBLICATIONS OF THE INSTITUTE

1. Report on Attitude Survey Bihar Community Projects —Price Rs. 1. 25.

2. Administrative Implications of Planning with special reference to India by Prof. D. G. Karve—Price Rs. 3.

3. Democracy and Public Administration, by Shri Sri Prakasa—Price Rs. O. 50.

4. The Sinews of the State by Shri Chintaman Deshmukh

5. Bulletin of the Institute of Public Administration —Annual Subscription Rs. 3.

All enquiries regarding sale and subscription may be addressed to the Director, Institute of Public Administration, Patna University, Patna 5.